

**CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE  
NEW NORTH DAM 115kV SUBSTATION,  
CLARENDON COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA**



**CHICORA RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION 496**

# **CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE NEW NORTH DAM 115kV SUBSTATION, CLARENDON COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA**

Prepared By:  
Michael Trinkley, Ph.D., RPA  
and  
Nicole Southerland

Prepared For:  
Mr. Tommy L. Jackson  
Central Electric Power Cooperative  
P.O. Box 1455  
Columbia, SC 29202

**CHICORA RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION 496**



Chicora Foundation, Inc.  
PO Box 8664  
Columbia, SC 29202-8664  
803/787-6910  
[www.chicora.org](http://www.chicora.org)

June 19, 2008

This report is printed on permanent paper ∞

©2008 by Chicora Foundation, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted, or transcribed in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without prior permission of Chicora Foundation, Inc. except for brief quotations used in reviews. Full credit must be given to the authors, publisher, and project sponsor.

## ABSTRACT

This study reports on an intensive cultural resources survey of a 2.4 acre substation in the southeastern portion of Clarendon County, just north of the Santee Dam in South Carolina. The work was conducted to assist Central Electric Power Cooperative comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the regulations codified in 36CFR800.

The lot is to be used by Santee Electric Cooperative for the construction of a distribution substation. The new substation will be an extension of an existing 1.0 acre substation to the north. The topography slopes down to the east toward a drainage from Church Branch.

The proposed substation will require the clearing of the area, followed by construction of the proposed facility. These activities have the potential to affect archaeological and historical sites and this survey was conducted to identify and assess archaeological and historical sites that may be on or within sight of the substation lot. For this study, an area of potential effect (APE) 0.5 mile around the substation was assumed.

An investigation of the archaeological site files at the S.C. Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology failed to identify any previously recorded sites.

The S.C. Department of Archives and History GIS was consulted for any previously recorded sites. No sites were recorded in the APE.

The archaeological survey of the substation lot incorporated shovel testing at 100-foot intervals along transects placed at 100-foot intervals along SC 260. All shovel test fill was screened through ¼-inch mesh and the shovel tests were backfilled at the completion of the study. A total of 14 shovel tests were excavated

along four transect lines.

As a result of these investigations no sites were identified. This is likely due to the lack of any distinct ridge top and distance from a permanent water source.

A survey of public roads within a 0.5 mile of the proposed undertaking was conducted in an effort to identify any architectural sites over 50 years old which also retained their integrity. No such sites were found.

Finally, it is possible that archaeological remains may be encountered in the project area during clearing activities. Crews should be advised to report any discoveries of concentrations of artifacts (such as bottles, ceramics, or projectile points) or brick rubble to the project engineer, who should in turn report the material to the State Historic Preservation Office or to Chicora Foundation (the process of dealing with late discoveries is discussed in 36CFR800.13(b)(3)). No construction should take place in the vicinity of these late discoveries until they have been examined by an archaeologist and, if necessary, have been processed according to 36CFR800.13(b)(3).



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |    |    |
|--|----|----|
| List of Figures                                  |    | iv |
| Introduction                                     |    | 1  |
| Natural Environment                              |    | 5  |
| <i>Physiography and Geology</i>                  | 5  |    |
| <i>Climate</i>                                   | 5  |    |
| <i>Soils</i>                                     | 6  |    |
| <i>Floristics</i>                                | 6  |    |
| Prehistoric and Historic Synopsis                |    | 7  |
| <i>Previous Research</i>                         | 7  |    |
| <i>Prehistoric Overview</i>                      | 7  |    |
| <i>Historic Overview</i>                         | 9  |    |
| Research Methods and Findings                    |    | 13 |
| <i>Archaeological Field Methods and Findings</i> | 13 |    |
| <i>Architectural Survey</i>                      | 13 |    |
| <i>Site Evaluation and Findings</i>              | 14 |    |
| Conclusions                                      |    | 17 |
| Sources Cited                                    |    | 19 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

### Figure

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. Project vicinity in Clarendon County  | 2  |
| 2. Survey area   | 3  |
| 3. View of mixed pine and hardwood forest along SC 260                                   | 5  |
| 4. Generalized cultural sequence for South Carolina                                      | 8  |
| 5. Portion of Mills' <i>Atlas</i> showing the project vicinity                           | 10 |
| 6. Portion of the 1950 <i>General Highway and Transportation Map of Clarendon County</i> | 11 |
| 7. View of the existing substation.  | 13 |
| 8. Substation lot with transects   | 14 |
| 9. Shovel testing in the project area  | 15 |

## INTRODUCTION

This investigation was conducted by Dr. Michael Trinkley of Chicora Foundation, Inc. for Mr. Tommy L. Jackson of Central Electric Power Cooperative in Columbia, South Carolina. The work was conducted to assist Santee Electric Cooperative comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the regulations codified in 36CFR800.

The project site consists of a lot measuring about 2.4 acres for use as a substation, situated in southeast Clarendon County south of the town of Jordan (Figure 1). The substation lot runs along SC 260 to the west and an existing transmission line to the east.

The lot consists of land that slopes down to the east toward a drainage of Church Branch. Vegetation on the lot consists of a mixed pine and hardwood forest; however, the modern topographic map that was revised in 1987, shows the project area as agricultural fields.

The lot, as previously mentioned, is intended to be used as a substation for a 115kV distribution station. Landscape alteration, primarily clearing, subsequent erection of the poles and other facilities, erecting lines, and long-term maintenance of the substation will cause damage to the ground surface and any archaeological resources that may be present in the survey area.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the substation may also have an impact on historic resources in the project area. Although the project will not remove any structures, substations (as well as other above grade projects) may detract from the visual integrity of historic properties, creating what many consider discordant surroundings. As a result, this architectural survey uses an area of potential effect

(APE) about 0.5 mile in diameter around the proposed facility.

This study, however, does not consider any future secondary impact of the project, including increased or expanded development or expansion of a transmission corridor in this portion of Clarendon County.

We were requested by Mr. Tommy L. Jackson of Central Electric Power Cooperative to perform a cultural resources survey on May 20, 2008. This included examination of the site files at the S.C. Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. As a result of that work no previously identified sites were found.

Initial background investigations also incorporated a review of the GIS at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History. As a result of that work, no sites were recorded in the APE. Although various small SHPO surveys have been conducted in parts of the County, no comprehensive architectural survey has been completed for Clarendon.

Archival and historical research was limited to a review of secondary sources available in the Chicora Foundation files.

The archaeological survey was conducted on June 18, 2008 by Ms. Ashley Gube and Ms. Nicole Southerland under the direction of Dr. Michael Trinkley.

This report details the investigation of the project area undertaken by Chicora Foundation and the results of that investigation.






Figure 1. Project vicinity in Clarendon County (basemap is USGS South Carolina 1:500,000).






Figure 2. Survey area (basemap is USGS Jordan 7.5').





## NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

### Physiography and Geology

Clarendon County is situated in the Middle Coastal Plain of South Carolina, south of the Fall Line. Elevations in the Middle Coastal Plain range from 220 to 350 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), with the topography being gently rolling. As Kovacik and Winberry (1987:20) observe, it can be very difficult to distinguish the Middle Coastal Plain from that of the Sand Hills to the north or even the lower Piedmont. You find the flatter, and almost featureless Coastal Plain topography further to the south and southeast, south of the Citronelle Escarpment (Orangeburg Scarp).

The Carolina Sand Hills to the north are an area of discontinuous hilly topography characterized by rounded hills with gentle slopes, moderate relief, and sandy soils. Although technically part of the Coastal Plain geology, the Sand Hills are distinct geographically. Much of the sand was blown into dunes during the Miocene, although weathered clays and very old river deposits lie directly on the crystalline rocks of the Piedmont (Kovacik and Winberry 1987; Murphy 1995).

Clarendon County is situated in the south-central part of South Carolina. It is bounded to the north by Sumter County, to the northeast by Florence County, to the east by Williamsburg County, and to the south by Orangeburg and

Berkeley Counties. A small portion of Calhoun County borders to the west. Lake Marion forms the border between Clarendon and Orangeburg Counties, which was created in the 1930s from damming the Santee River.

Lake Marion is located less than a mile south of the project area with Church Branch about 0.5 mile to the east.

### Climate

This portion of South Carolina is dominated by the movement of weather systems across the country, but there are relatively few complete exchanges of air masses in the summer. This results in few breaks in the midsummer heat, with temperatures ranging from the high 80s to the low 90s. In contrast, winters are mild and relatively short. There are 48 inches of annual precipitation, with August producing the most precipitation for the year (Gerald 1972).



Figure 3. View of mixed pine and hardwood forest along SC 260.

Mills distinguishes between the swamp lands and the sand lands in his assessment of nearby Orangeburg's health, which has similar conditions to Clarendon. He says:

the sandhill section of this district presents as fine and healthy a climate as any country can boast of. Diseases are rare here . . . . Along the margins of the creeks and rivers, and within the influence of swamps, bays, and stagnant ponds, fevers and agues, bilious remittents, typhus, and other inflammatory diseases prevail (Mills 1972 [1826]:664).

In the early nineteenth century Mills comments that the river lands were dominated by "the magnolia, beech, willow, ash, elm, oak, birch, walnut, and hickory" while the deeper swamp were "large groups of cypress, loblolly, bay, sweet bay, maple, tupelo, and poplar trees of an immense height and circumference" (Mills 1972[1826]:658).

Although the project area is surrounded by fields, the lot is covered in a mixed pine and hardwood forest. As late as 1987 (the date of the most recent topographic map), the project area is shown as agricultural fields.

## **Soils**

Mills commented that the nearby Orangeburg District included a variety of soils. Most were described as having "a light, sandy nature, thin soil, but bottomed on clay" (Mills 1972 [1826]:658). This clay bottom helps minimize the droughty nature of the sandy soils. Along the Congaree and Santee rivers he observed a very different soil, described as "a stiff, red clay" found on rolling hills – a description of a small area of the piedmont which is today part of Calhoun County to the west.

Today we recognize that the survey area consists of soils characteristic of the Dothan-Lynchburg-Rains association. These soils are generally well drained and poorly drained soils that have a sandy surface layer and loamy subsoil (Gerald 1972).

The proposed substation lot incorporates one soil series – Dothan. These well drained soils have an Ap horizon of grayish brown (10YR5/2) loamy fine sand to 0.6 foot in depth over a very pale brown (10YR7/4) loamy fine sand to a depth of 1.3 feet. The slopes in the project area measure up to 2%.

## **Floristics**

## PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SYNOPSIS

### Previous Research

Clarendon County has received very little archaeological attention, with Derting et al. (1991) citing only 26 different studies. Most of the studies appear to be compliance reports. However, a few of the reports are from Leland Ferguson's (1973) work at the Santee Indian Mound/Fort Watson.

Another project, and within 0.5 mile of the current survey, is a portion of a survey performed for the Santee Cooper Hydroelectric Project in 2002 (Bailey 2002). Over 150,308 acres were examined with 22 archaeological sites recorded. More recently, Chicora has conducted an archaeological reconnaissance for a 4,000 acre development in the vicinity of St. Paul. This work documented eighteenth and nineteenth century plantation settlements, as well as extensive postbellum tenant dwellings (Trinkley and Southerland 2008).

### Prehistoric Overview

The Paleoindian period, lasting from 12,000 to 8,000 B.C., is evidenced by basally thinned, side-notched projectile points; fluted, lanceolate projectile points; side scrapers; end scrapers; and drills (Coe 1964; Michie 1977). The Paleoindian occupation, while widespread, does not appear to have been intensive. Points usually associated with this period include the Clovis and several variants, Suwannee, Simpson, and Dalton (Goodyear et al. 1989:36-38).

At least one Paleoindian point has been found in the nearby Calhoun area, reportedly from the Little Bull Swamp Creek drainage (Goodyear et al. 1989:33). This pattern of artifacts found along major river drainages has been interpreted by Michie to support the concept of an

economy "oriented towards the exploitation of now extinct mega-fauna" (Michie 1977:124).

Unfortunately, little is known about Paleoindian subsistence strategies, settlement systems, or social organization. Generally, archaeologists agree that the Paleoindian groups were at a band level of society, were nomadic, and were both hunters and foragers. While population density, based on the isolated finds, is thought to have been low, Walthall suggests that toward the end of the period, "there was an increase in population density and in territoriality and that a number of new resource areas were beginning to be exploited" (Walthall 1980:30).

The Archaic period, which dates from 8000 to 1000 B.C., does not form a sharp break with the Paleoindian period, but is a slow transition characterized by a modern climate and an increase in the diversity of material culture. The chronology established by Coe (1964) for the North Carolina Piedmont may be applied with little modification to the Clarendon County area. Archaic period assemblages, characterized by corner-notched, side-notched, and broad stemmed projectile points, are common in the vicinity, although they rarely are found in good, well-preserved contexts.

The Woodland period begins, by definition, with the introduction of fired clay pottery about 2000 B.C. along the South Carolina coast, about 1000 B.C. in the Upper Coastal Plain, and much later in the Carolina Piedmont, perhaps 500 B.C. It should be noted that many researchers call the period from about 2500 to 1000 B.C. the Late Archaic because of a perceived continuation of the Archaic lifestyle in spite of the manufacture of pottery. Regardless of terminology, the period from 2000 to 500 B.C. was a period of tremendous change.

| Dates  | Period      | Sub-Period | Regional Phases                       |                           |                              |
|--------|-------------|------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
|        |             |            | COASTAL                               | MIDDLE SAVANNAH VALLEY    | CENTRAL CAROLINA<br>PIEDMONT |
| 1715   | HIST.       | EARLY      | Altamaha                              |                           | Caraway                      |
| 1650   |             | LATE       | Irene / Pee Dee                       | Rembert<br>Hollywood      | Dan River                    |
| 1100   | MISS.       | EARLY      | Savannah                              | Lawton<br>Savannah        | Pee Dee                      |
| 800    | WOODLAND    | LATE       | St. Catherines / Swift Creek          |                           | Uwharrie                     |
| A.D.   |             | MIDDLE     | Wilmington                            | Sand Tempered Wilmington? |                              |
| B.C.   |             |            | Deptford                              | Deptford                  | Yadkin                       |
| 300    |             | EARLY      |                                       | Refuge                    | Badin                        |
| 1000   | ARCHAIC     | LATE       | Thom's Creek Stallings                |                           |                              |
| 2000   |             |            | Savannah River Halifax                |                           |                              |
| 3000   |             | MIDDLE     | Guilford<br>Morrow Mountain<br>Stanly |                           |                              |
| 5000   | PALEOINDIAN | EARLY      |                                       |                           |                              |
| 8000   |             |            | Kirk                                  |                           |                              |
|        |             |            | Palmer                                |                           |                              |
| 10,000 |             |            | Hardaway                              |                           |                              |
|        |             |            | Hardaway - Dalton                     |                           |                              |
| 12,000 |             |            | Cumberland                            | Clovis                    | Simpson                      |

Figure 4. Generalized cultural sequence for South Carolina.

The subsistence economy during this early period was based primarily on deer hunting and fishing, with supplemental inclusions of small mammals, birds, reptiles, and shellfish. Various calculations of the probable yield of deer, fish, and other food sources identified from some coastal sites indicate that sedentary life was not only possible, but probable. Further inland it seems likely that many Native American groups

continued the previously established patterns of band mobility. These frequent moves would allow the groups to take advantage of various seasonal resources, such as shad and sturgeon in the spring, nut masts in the fall, and turkeys during the winter.

The South Appalachian Mississippian period, from about A.D. 1100 to A.D. 1640 is the most elaborate level of culture attained by the

native inhabitants and is followed by cultural disintegration brought about largely by European disease. The period is characterized by complicated stamped pottery, complex social organization, agriculture, and the construction of temple mounds and ceremonial centers. The earliest coastal phases are named the Savannah and Irene (known as Pee Dee further inland) (A.D. 1200 to 1550).

However little we know about the various small coastal tribes, considerably less is known about the protohistoric and historic tribes in the Upper Coastal Plain. The study area is, in very general terms, situated between the Pocotaligo and Santee. Mooney (1894:80) devotes a modest few paragraphs to the Santee.

For the Santee we know that Lawson found them in the vicinity of the Santee Indian mounds in 1701 (Lefler 1967:25-29; Mooney 1894:79). The tribe is reported to live in small hamlets, with Lawson remarking, "there being Plantations lying scattering here and there, for a great many Miles" (Lefler 1967:25). In fact, the settlements continued up river at least to Jacks Creek, and there were hunting camps at least as far up as the High Hills of Santee (Hicks 1998:30).

Mooney reports that just prior to the Yemassee War there were still two villages about 70 miles from Charleston and perhaps as many as 160 individuals (Mooney 1894:80). Taukchiray provides a little more detail, revealing that the remains of the tribe were captured by the English and Etiwan Indians and transported to Charleston. There the men were shipped to the West Indies as slaves and the women and children were turned over the Etiwans as slaves (Hicks 1998:30), marking the end of the tribe.

### **Historic Overview**

The area, which is today Clarendon County, was primarily occupied by the Santee and Wateree Indians, with the earliest accounts taken from Spanish explorers in 1526 (Quattlebaum 1956). During the Yemassee War of 1715 both the

Wateree and Santee joined the Indian uprising, only to have their power broken. Afterwards the remnants apparently joined together, possibly with the Catawba (Swanton 1946). Gregorie (1954:7) mentions that Sumter County, to the north, remained part of the Catawba hunting territory at least as late as 1748, with a camp existing near "The Raft" in the Wateree River Swamp until 1750. Mills, in the early nineteenth century, expressed the situation concisely:

[a] number of tribes of Indians inhabited this country originally; but little care has been taken to preserve either their names or locations (Mills 1972 [1826]:749).

The area saw some action during the American Revolution, especially at the nearby Santee Indian Mound, which became the outpost, Fort Watson. The British Army built the fort on top of the mound, which overlooked the Santee River. After one successful defense by the British, the Americans eventually caused the surrender of the British by building a tower high enough to fire at the fort ("Santee Indian Mound and Fort Watson" pamphlet from October 2002 by the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Wildlife Refuge System).

During the late eighteenth century, Clarendon went through a series of administrative boundary changes. In 1785, Clarendon was created in the Camden District while in 1792 parts of Clarendon were lost to the now extinct Salem District (Long 1997). By 1800, Clarendon was part of the Sumter District and remained unchanged until 1857.

These legal changes did little to alter the basic framework of frontier life. Perhaps the most significant political and economic event, which brought about the creation of counties, was the Revolutionary War. In addition to the administrative changes, the bounty for indigo was no longer available and production of this once prosperous crop ceased (Gregorie 1954:56). The search for a new cash crop led to cotton, which






Figure 5. Portion of Mills' *Atlas* showing the project vicinity.

was introduced about 1785, although it was not until the 1793 invention of the cotton gin that the crop became common (Burke et al. 1943:6).

By the turn of the century green seed cotton was being commonly planted. Gregorie notes that:

the old staples, rice and indigo, had required large outlays of capital, and great plantations with slave gangs for the laborious work. Cotton, however, was a poor man's crop, and could be raised by white families that did not own even a single slave. But the profits of the crop in its early years, stirred ambitions in even the poorest farmers to buy more land and to acquire slaves (Gregorie 1954:109-110).

The early slave density in Sumter District was about three to five slaves per white family, with the largest plantation in the 1790 Clarendon County census owning only 145 slaves (Gregorie 1954:31). The 1790 census for both Clarendon and Clarendon counties numerate 2,910 slaves. By 1800 that number had increased to 6,563, and by

1820 there were over 16,000 slaves in Sumter District (Mills 1972[1826]:748). At that time, Mills observed that the "patrol laws are badly executed," and that the slaves are "numerous, and great pilferers" (Mills 1972 [1826]:746).

In spite of the sudden increase in the number of slaves and the size of land holdings, cotton prices had fallen from 44¢ per pound in 1799 to only 20¢ a pound in 1806. By 1812, the price was down to 42¢ and there began the long trek westward in search of new and more productive lands (Gregorie 1954:110). This migration

continued through the 1850s and in 1834 Camden reported 800 persons a year passing through to the west (Gregorie 1954:114).

In Mills' 1826 map of the Sumter District (Figure 5), the project area is situated between several drainages. Two settlements are shown in the vicinity, Captain John G. Davis and John G. Davis, however these do not appear to be in the project area.

As previously mentioned, by 1857, Clarendon once again changed its boundaries, becoming known as the Clarendon District. By 1868, the District was known as Clarendon County.


The importance of logging increased, becoming one of the largest industries in Clarendon County. In 1884, Thomas Wilson started Santee River Logging based out of Wilson's Mill (Fetters 1990). He eventually added a spur from the existing Charleston, Sumter & Northern line that ran to Coskereys (now known as St. Paul). This line ran both logging and carrier trains (Fetters 1990).

Competition between the different rail

lines caused the Atlantic Coast Line (ACL) to purchase parts of the Charleston, Sumter & Northern Railroad (Fetters 1990). This section of tracts was then sold to the Wilson & Summerton line. Portions of the line were then removed to prevent the trains' movement on the tracts (Fetters 1990).

One of the largest logging operations in South Carolina was the Brooklyn Cooperage Company, based out of Sumter (Fetters 1990). The company was established in the 1850s with plants in Brooklyn, Boston, Philadelphia, and New Orleans (Fetters 1990:111). In 1927, the company bought land near St. Paul and started an operation in Sumter. The operation near St. Paul lasted from 1928 to 1934. The Brooklyn Cooperage Mill replaced the tracts once belonging to the Charleston, Sumter & Northern Railroad. The mill then moved to Rimini, then to Williamsburg County, where it remained until 1947.

The 1950 *General Highway and Transportation Map of Clarendon County* (Figure 6) shows two structures in the vicinity of the project area, however no remains were found in the field.





## RESEARCH METHODS AND FINDINGS

### Archaeological Field Methods and Findings

The initially proposed field techniques involved the placement of shovel tests at 100-foot intervals along transects placed every 100 feet along SC 260.

All soil would be screened through ¼-inch mesh, with each test numbered sequentially. Each test would measure about 1 foot square and would normally be taken to a depth of at least 1.0 foot or until subsoil was encountered. All cultural remains would be collected, except for mortar and brick, which would be quantitatively noted in the field and discarded. Notes would be maintained for profiles at any sites encountered.

Should sites (defined by the presence of three or more artifacts from either surface survey or shovel tests within a 50 feet area) be identified, further tests would be used to obtain data on site boundaries, artifact quantity and diversity, site

integrity, and temporal affiliation. These tests would be placed at 25 to 50 feet intervals in a simple cruciform pattern until two consecutive negative shovel tests were encountered. The information required for completion of South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology site forms would be collected and photographs would be taken, if warranted in the opinion of the field investigators.

Transects were placed along SC 260 from the south to the north. Shovel tests were excavated to the east. A total of 14 shovel tests were excavated within the project area.

Analysis of collections would follow professionally accepted standards with a level of intensity suitable to the quantity and quality of the remains.

Nevertheless, the archaeological survey of the tract failed to identify any remains. This is likely due to the lack of any distinct ridge top and distance from a permanent water source.

### Architectural Survey

As previously discussed, we elected to use a 0.5 mile area of potential effect (APE). The architectural survey would record buildings, sites, structures, and objects that appeared to have been constructed before 1950. Typical of such projects, this survey recorded only those which have retained “some measure of its historic




Figure 7. View of the existing substation. The wooded area to the rear is the current project area.

integrity" (Vivian n.d.:5) and which were visible from public roads.

For each identified resource we would complete a Statewide Survey Site Form and at

### Site Evaluation and Findings

Archaeological sites would be evaluated for further work based on the eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. Chicora



least two representative photographs were taken. Permanent control numbers would be assigned by the Survey Staff of the S.C. Department of Archives and History at the conclusion of the study. The Site Forms for the resources identified during this study would be submitted to the S.C. Department of Archives and History.

Foundation only provides an opinion of National Register eligibility and the final determination is made by the lead federal agency, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

The criteria for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places is described by



36CFR60.4, which states:

the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and

a. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

b. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

c. that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

d. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

*National Register Bulletin 36* (Townsend et al. 1993) provides an evaluative process that contains five steps for forming a clearly defined explicit rationale for either the site's eligibility or lack of eligibility. Briefly, these steps are:

- identification of the site's data sets or categories of archaeological information such as ceramics, lithics, subsistence remains, architectural remains, or sub-surface features;

- identification of the historic context applicable to the site, providing a framework for the evaluative process;

- identification of the important research questions the site might be able to address, given the data



Figure 9. Shovel testing in the project area.

sets and the context;

- evaluation of the site's archaeological integrity to ensure that the data sets were sufficiently well preserved to address the research questions; and

- identification of important research questions among all of those which might be asked and answered at the site.

This approach, of course, has been developed for use documenting eligibility of sites being actually nominated to the National Register of Historic Places where the evaluative process must stand alone, with relatively little reference to other documentation and where typically only one site is being considered. As a result, some aspects of the evaluative process have been summarized, but we have tried to focus on an archaeological site's ability to address significant research topics within the context of its available data sets.

No historic structures, however, were found within 0.5 mile of the project area. The only domestic structures in sight of the substation are mobile and manufactured homes.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study involved the examination of approximately 2.4 acres of land for a substation in the southeastern portion of Clarendon County. This work, conducted for Mr. Tommy L. Jackson of Central Electric Power Cooperative, examined archaeological sites and cultural resources found on the proposed project tract and is intended to assist Santee Electric Cooperative in complying with their historic preservation responsibilities.

As a result of this investigation no sites were identified. This is likely the result of the lack of a distinct ridge top and distance from a permanent water source.

A survey of public roads within 0.5 mile revealed no structures that retain the integrity

needed for the National Register of Historic Places.

It is possible that archaeological remains may be encountered during construction activities. As always, contractors should be advised to report any discoveries of concentrations of artifacts (such as bottles, ceramics, or projectile points) or brick rubble to the project engineer, who should in turn report the material to the State Historic Preservation Office, or Chicora Foundation (the process of dealing with late discoveries is discussed in 36CFR800.13(b)(3)). No further land altering activities should take place in the vicinity of these discoveries until they have been examined by an archaeologist and, if necessary, have been processed according to 36CFR800.13(b)(3).





## SOURCES CITED

- Baicy, Daniel and Jennifer Stewart  
 2005 *Cultural Resources Survey, Proposed Intersection Safety Project, US-301 and S-63, Clarendon County, South Carolina*. Coastal Carolina Research.
- Bailey, Ralph  
 2002 *Cultural Resources Survey of the Santee Cooper Hydroelectric Project*. Brockington and Associates.
- Burke, T.T., W.D. Lee, and C.S. Basalik  
 1943 *Soil Survey of Sumter County, South Carolina*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Plant Industry, Washington, D.C.
- Coe, Joffre L.  
 1964 *The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 54(5).
- Derting, Keith M., Sharon L. Pekrul, and Charles J. Rinehart  
 1991 *A Comprehensive Bibliography of South Carolina Archaeology*. Research Manuscript 211. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Ferguson, Leland G.  
 1973 *Exploratory Archeology at the Scott's Lake Site (38CR1), Santee Indian Mound-Ft. Watson, Summer 1972*. Research Manuscript Series 36. S.C. Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia.
- Fetters, Thomas  
 1990 *Logging Railroads of South Carolina*. Heimburger House Publishing Co., Illinois.
- Gerald, Talbert R.  
 1972 *Soil Survey of Clarendon County, South Carolina*. U.S.D.A., Washington, D.C.
- Goodyear, Albert C., III, James L. Michie, and Tommy Charles  
 1989 *The Earliest South Carolinians*. In *Studies in South Carolina Archaeology*, edited by Albert C. Goodyear, III and Glen T. Hanson, pp. 19-52. S.C. Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of S.C., Columbia.
- Gregorie, Anee King  
 1954 *History of Sumter County, South Carolina*. Library Board of Sumter County, Sumter, South Carolina.
- Harvey, Bruce  
 1999 *An Architectural Survey and Literature Review of a Proposed Road By-Pass, City of Manning, Clarendon County, South Carolina*. Brockington and Associates, Charleston.
- 2000 *Intensive Cultural Resources Survey of US521 Improvements Project From South Carolina Route 261 to Greeleyville, Clarendon and Williamsburg Counties, South Carolina*. Brockington and Associates, Charleston.

- Hicks, Theresa M., editor  
 1998 *South Carolina Indians, Indian Traders and Other Ethnic Connections Beginning in 1670.* The Reprint Company, Spartanburg, South Carolina.
- Kovacik, Charles F. and John J. Winberry  
 1987 *South Carolina: The Making of a Landscape.* University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.
- Lefler, Hugh T., editor  
 1967 *A New Voyage to Carolina.* University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Long, John H., editor  
 1997 *South Carolina Atlas of Historical County Boundaries.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Michie, James  
 1977 *The Late Pleistocene Human Occupation of South Carolina.* Unpublished Honor's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Mills, Robert  
 1972[1826] *Statistics of South Carolina.* Hurlbut and Lloyd, Charleston, South Carolina. 1972 facsimile ed. The Reprint Company, Spartanburg, South Carolina.
- Mooney, James  
 1894 *The Siouan Tribes of the East.* Bulletin 22. Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D.C.
- Murphy, Carolyn Hanna  
 1995 *Carolina Rocks: The Geology of South Carolina.* Sandlapper Publishing, Orangeburg, South Carolina.
- Quattlebaum, Paul  
 1956 *The Land Called Chicora.* University of Florida Press, Gainesville.
- South, Stanley A.  
 1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology.* Academic Press, New York.
- Swanton, John R.  
 1946 *Indians of the Southeastern United States.* Bulletin 137. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D.C.
- Townsend, Jan, John H. Sprinkle, Jr., and John Knoerl  
 1993 *Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Historical Archaeological Sites and Districts.* Bulletin 36. National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places, Washington, D.C.
- Trinkley, Michael and Nicole Southerland  
 2008 *Reconnaissance Cultural Resources Survey of Cantey Bay Plantation, Clarendon County, South Carolina.* Research Contribution 494. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia.
- Vivian, Daniel J.  
 n.d. *South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties.* State Historic Preservation Office, Columbia.
- Walthall, John A.  
 1980 *Prehistoric Indians of the Southeast: Archaeology of Alabama.* University of Alabama Press.

**Archaeological  
Investigations**

**Historical Research**

**Preservation**

**Education**

**Interpretation**

**Heritage Marketing**

**Museum Support  
Programs**



**Chicora Foundation, Inc.**  
PO Box 8664 • 861 Arbutus Drive  
Columbia, SC 29202-8664  
Tel: 803-787-6910  
Fax: 803-787-6910  
Email: [Chicora@earthlink.net](mailto:Chicora@earthlink.net)  
[www.chicora.org](http://www.chicora.org)